

REMARKS

This amendment accompanies the filing of a REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION following the final office action mailed October 10, 2006. Claims 1-3, 8-14, 16-27, 29-34 and 36-37 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Pat. No. 5,438,517 ("Sennott") and U.S. Pat. No. 6,868,175 ("Yamamoto"), Claims 4, 15, 28 and 35 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Sennott, Yamamoto and U.S. Pat. No. 6,639,592 ("Dayanand"), and Claims 5-7 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Sennott, Yamamoto and U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,164 ("Rohm").

Applicants greatly appreciated the efforts of Examiner Mellisa Chojnacki and Examiner Charles Ronen in an interview conducted on February 8, 2007. Pursuant the Examiners' recommendations, Applicants hereinwith submit additional evidence of reduction to practice of the claimed invention prior to the date of the Yamamoto patent.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Applicants submit that Claims 1-37 are in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Applicants' Claims 1-3, 8-14, 16-27, 29-34 and 36-37 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Sennott and Yamamoto, Claims 4, 15, 28 and 35 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Sennott, Yamamoto and Dayanand, and Claims 5-7 were rejected as obvious in view of the combination of Sennott, Yamamoto and Rohm. Please find enclosed herewith a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 providing evidence of reduction of practice of the invention claimed in the present application prior to the Yamamoto patent. In the Declaration, the Applicants have provided source code (Exhibit 1) that performs the claimed invention. Specifically, the source code fits a polynomial spline to a geographic feature by applying a least squares approximation to data points specifying latitude and longitude coordinates to generate a plurality of control points for the polynomial spline. The Declaration also includes an output plot (Exhibit 2) generated using the source code that illustrates the source code had been tested and found to work.

Accordingly, the Yamamoto patent is not available as prior art against the claims of the present application. Thus, Applicants request that the rejection of pending Claims 1-37 be withdrawn.

Petition for Extension of Time

Included with this response is a request for an extension of time to reply to the office action dated October 10, 2006. Included with this response is an authorization for payment of the fee associated with this request.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the final office action mailed October 10, 2006 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365